AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

Submitted herewith is a replacement sheet of Fig. 1 showing descriptive labels as requested by the examiner.

REMARKS

Claims 1, 2 and 4-12 are all the claims pending in the application. Reconsideration of the application and allowance of all claims are respectfully requested.

Submitted herewith is a corrected Fig. 1 as requested by the examiner.

All claims stand rejected as unpatentable over Hino (USP 6,172,976) in view of Wallenius et al (USP 6,526,134). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The present invention is directed to an arrangement wherein two connection control modules which are part of the same switching node can each handle a half call and then can communicate with one another to connected their respective half calls. According to claim 1, the claimed switching node includes a first service control module having a first service interface and a first physical device interface module for establishing a connection to a first physical device, a second service control module having a second service interface and a second physical device interface module for establishing a connection to a second physical device, and a communication channel between the first and second connection control modules by which one of the first and second connection control modules can send to the other a link request message indicating that a connection is to be made between the first and second physical devices.

Hino does not teach the arrangement of elements, including the communication channel between two connection control modules as recited in claim 1. In the present rejection, the examiner acknowledges that Hino does not teach two connection control modules within the same node which can each handle a half call and can then connect their half calls together, and relies on Wallenius et al for this teaching. Wallenius does teach the handling of an inbound half

call and an outbound half call and the connection of the two together, but this is not all that is missing in Hino.

Claim 1 does not simply recite two half calls to be connected together. Rather, claim 1 recites components in the connection control modules for responding to request messages from two different service control modules for establishing connections to respective physical devices, and then one connection control module sends a link request to the other to cause a connection to be made between the first and second physical device.

Wallenius teaches that an incoming half call can be connected to an outgoing half call, but is otherwise far different from the present invention. In particular, there is no establishment of connections to first and second physical devices and then one connection control module advising the other connection control module that a connection is to be established between the two physical devices. In the present invention, the connection control modules each respond to requests by establishing connections to respective physical devices. The requests both come in from the same "direction." In Wallennius, one half call comes inbound and the other half call is outbound. There are no two different physical devices which are connected to by each of the two connection control modules in response to respective requests. Further, there is no need for one connection control module to send a message to the other connection control module to advise the latter connection control module that a connection is to be established between the two physical devices. To the contrary, each connection control module already knows that it is a respective incoming or outgoing half call.

If one of skill in the art were to consider Wallenius, it ***might*** have been obvious to modify Hino such that when establishing a call between terminal A and terminal B it might set up a first

half call from terminal A to the node and a second half call from the node to the terminal B and then connect the two half calls. But in doing so, the first half call would not be a connection set up in response to a service request from a second service control module, but instead would be an outbound connection set up in response to either the node itself or in response to the first service request from the first service control module. Further, there would not be two separate connections to respective physical devices and a message from one connection control module to the other advising that a connection is to be established between the two physical devices.

In sum, while Wallenius may teach the general concept of having a call broken down into two half calls, it does it with inbound and outbound halves of the same call. It does not send a message from an intermediate point in the first connection path to an intermediate point in the second connection path, and there is no reason, absent hindsight, to conclude that it would have taught the artisan to do this in Hino.

Accordingly, it is submitted that the claimed invention would not have been obvious from the teachings of the prior art, and allowance of all claims is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

/DJCushing/
David J. Cushing
Registration No. 28,703

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860
WASHINGTON OFFICE
23373
CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: August 16, 2007